After relating these and other similar illustrations of * organizer ' action, Huxley remarks : ' I have said enough to justify my assertion that biology is getting more mechanistic. Forty years ago the development of an animal from an egg was almost as completely mysterious as in the days of Aristotle. Twenty years ago we had begun to find out some of the rules which living things obeyed during their development. Ten years^ ago the organizer had not been discovered. To-day we are *on the verge of having its organizing powers reduced to a chemical formula and stored in a bottle'* Huxley adds: * It is perfectly true that to have this knowledge doesn't make life and its development any the less wonderful and extraordinary; however, it is not wonderful because of some mysterious vital force, but because of the astonishing properties of the matter of which it is made. Modern biology is not making us believe that spirit rules matter in the affairs of life; it is showing us that matter and its workings are both more important and more interesting than we had thought.'

Needham uses very similar language, though a little less explicitly mechanistic, when he speaks of the * organizer' as [c] radiating its organizing power '. That is to say that, like Huxley, he asserts or implies that the Organizer' does the 'organizing'. We have here an excellent illustration of the blinding power of the mechanistic prejudice: it leads these two very able men *to jump to a conclusion, the error of which is

too obvious for controversy—namely, the conclusion that the <organizer' effects the organization of brain, spinal cord, sense-organs, Sec., &c., *and* arranges these organs in their normal rektions to one another. The conclusion would be justified only if these results- followed the